

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the present application, with claims 1, 17 and 32 being the independent claims. Each of independent claims 1, 17 and 32 has been amended herein to more clearly recite that the time period of interest selected for the timeline in accordance with the invention is selected from a plurality of time periods of interest. No new matter was added.

In the Official Action, dated February 10, 2006, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, for being subject to multiple interpretations. Claims 1-2, 5-6, 9-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 102(e) as anticipated by US Publication No. 2002/0002562 A1 (Moran), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moran in view of US Patent No.6,833,848 (Wolff). Claims 17-18, 21-22, 24-33, 36-37 and 39-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moran in view of Wolff. Claims 3-4, 19-20 and 34-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moran in view of US Patent No. 6,570,582 (Sciammarella) and also as unpatentable over Moran in view of Wolff and further in view of Sciammarella. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moran in view of US Patent No. 6,014,135 (Fernandes). Claims 23 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moran in view of Wolff and further in view of Fernandes. Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as unpatentable over Moran.

The outstanding rejections to the claims based on the art of record are respectfully traversed based on the present amendments and below remarks.

Summary of the Invention

With Applicants' invention, events, people, places and things are distilled to the items relevant to the user for a selected time period based upon cross-correlative analysis. To illustrate the poignancy of Applicants' invention, a few relevant portions of the specification are discussed as follows:

In the example shown in Applicants' Fig. 3, for instance, events, people, places and things can be displayed at an "hour" level of relevance, but based upon a user's input in portion 230a, the events, people, places and things can be displayed at any level of temporal generality including an hour view, day view, weekly view, monthly view, yearly view, etc. (See page 17, lines 18-23). Fig. 6 shows the situation where a user has scrolled back three months prior to the time period shown by Figs. 3 through 5, resulting in the items shown on the timeline 230 being different since the time period of interest has been changed. (See page 18, lines 26-29).

Moreover, as shown in Figs. 8 and 9, elements in the navigation region 210 can be dragged to the filter 220, affecting the display of the timeline 230. The timeline 230 then filters using the element, or elements, to show the last time the element(s) were relevant in time along with the N prior times showing a total of N+1 instances of the element(s) being relevant to the timeline 230. If the timeline 230 had been in an hour view via portion 230a and the element(s) were not relevant N+1 times in the hour view, the timeline 230 chooses the appropriate time, hour, day, week, month or year view automatically. If there are not N+1 relevant times, the timeline 230 displays whatever elements are available for the filtering criteria. In a non-limiting exemplary embodiment, N is 10. (See page 19, lines 13-23).

Thus, first with the invention, a time period of interest (e.g., an hourly view, a weekly view, or a monthly view) is selected from a variety of time periods that may be specified either explicitly or implicitly.

Then, once the time period of interest is specified, elements from the user's digital history store are displayed on the timeline associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period of interest, wherein each event, person, place and thing has a unique icon. In this respect, no prior art technique is believed to couple the selection of a time period of interest for the timeline in conjunction with a user's personal history data store in the manner claimed by Applicants, as described more fully below.

Moran and the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103

Without conceding the propriety of the various combinations of references set forth in the Official Action, Applicants respectfully submit that the art of record is not believed to teach or suggest the step of "selecting a time period of interest from a plurality of time periods on the timeline," as recited in amended claim 1.

With respect to root reference Moran, section [0232], Fig. 17 and the *selection via indicator 1703* are the portions relied upon in the Official Action on page 3 for this disclosure. However, these passages are not believed to teach or suggest such limitation because indicator 1703 is merely understood to describe an instant in time, not a time period as with the present invention. For instance, section [0232] states in relevant part,

"The user moves playback time indicator 1703 in the timeline interface 1702 just before the visual indicator 1604. The Liveboard window 1701 is then updated to display what was on the LiveBoard at that *instant in time*."

Applicants respectfully submit that an instant in time is not the same as a "time period." An instant is an atomic moment in time. A time period is a time interval, covering

many (arguably infinite) instants in time. Thus, Moran cannot be said to teach or suggest “selecting a time period of interest from a plurality of time periods on the timeline,” as recited in claim 1.

There is a reason for this apparent difference in terminology. Applicants’ invention enables a user to select a time period, and various filters, such that items from the user’s personal history store are displayed on the timeline as germane to the filters and time period specified. Selecting a time period of interest drives what is displayed on the timeline for that time period of interest. In contrast, Moran describes meeting capture software that allows a user to control the playback of a meeting session. By selecting an instant in time during the meeting session, the playback software plays back meeting events that occurred at that exact time. Accordingly, Moran deals with instants, not time periods, on the timeline.

Moreover, while Fig. 17 of Moran displays a timeline, upon which playback time indicator 1703 may be used to select an instant in time, there is no selection of a time period of interest from a plurality of time periods of interest (hourly, weekly, monthly), as with Applicants’ invention.

Claims 17 and 32 include similar recitations, and are believed allowable at least for the same reasons. Wolff was cited for reasons related to its images pertaining to people places and things, but also does not cure at least the above-identified deficiency of root reference Moran. Sciammarella and Fernandes were cited for reasons relating to the dependent claims, but also fail to cure the above-identified deficiency of Moran with respect to Applicants’ independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 to claims 1, 17 and 32 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 2-16, 18-31 and 33-44 depend from base claims 1, 17 and 32, respectively, either directly or indirectly, and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to the above-identified claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102, 103 is respectfully requested.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

As mentioned, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, for alleged indefiniteness. In this regard, Applicants respectfully submit that the recitation of the claims is sufficiently definite to one of ordinary skill in the art to satisfy the statutory requirements.

For instance, as recited in claim 1, “displaying from the user’s digital history store on the timeline elements associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period of interest, wherein each event, person, place and thing has a unique icon associated therewith” means the following:

A user has a digital history store. From the user’s digital history store, elements are displayed on the timeline. Those elements are associated with events, people, places and things. Those elements also relate to the time period of interest selected. Finally, within this display context, each event, person, place and thing has a unique icon associated therewith.

Applicants respectfully submit that each of these limitations is sufficiently clear when viewed in this manner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is thus respectfully requested.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0741/188840.01
Application No.: 10/032,309
Office Action Dated: February 10, 2006

PATENT

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Office Action, and submit that Claims 1-44 of the application are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience is earnestly solicited.

Date: May 10, 2006



Thomas E. Watson
Registration No. 43,243

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439